

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
MARTINSBURG**

WILLIE LEE MOSLEY,

Petitioner,

v.

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:09-CV-06
CRIMINAL ACTION NO. 3:07-CR-44
(BAILEY)**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On this day, the above-styled matter came before the Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge John S. Kaull. By Local Rule, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Kaull for submission of a proposed report and a recommendation ("R & R"). Magistrate Judge Kaull filed his R & R on July 2, 2010 [Crim. Doc. 81 / Civ. Doc. 3]. In that filing, the magistrate judge recommended that this Court dismiss this § 2255 petition [Crim. Doc. 65 / Civ. Doc. 1].

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1) (c), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. ***Thomas v. Arn***, 474 U.S. 140,


150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and the right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); **Snyder v. Ridenour**, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); **United States v. Schronce**, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). Here, objections to Magistrate Judge Kaull's R & R were due within fourteen (14) days of receipt, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). This Court granted 30-day extensions on two separate occasions, the last of which made the petitioner's objections due on October 2, 2010 [Crim. Doc. 87]. The docket reflects that service was accepted on September 9, 2010. See Crim. Doc. 88. To date, no objections have been filed. Accordingly, this Court will review the report and recommendation for clear error.

Upon careful review of the report and recommendation, it is the opinion of this Court that the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation [**Crim. Doc. 81 / Civ. Doc. 3**] should be, and is, hereby **ORDERED ADOPTED** for the reasons more fully stated in the magistrate judge's report. As such, this Court hereby **DENIES** and **DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE** the petitioner's § 2255 petition [**Crim. Doc. 65 / Civ. Doc. 1**]. Therefore, this matter is hereby **ORDERED STRICKEN** from the active docket of this Court.

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to any counsel of record and to mail a copy to the *pro se* petitioner.

DATED: October 7, 2010.


JOHN PRESTON BAILEY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE